

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 58 through 87 are pending, with Claims 58, 63, 68, 73, 78, and 83 being independent. Claims 58, 59, 63, 68, 70, 73, 78, and 83 have been amended.

The specification was objected to on the grounds that the status of the parent application should be updated. The specification has been amended along the lines kindly suggested in the Official Action, thereby obviating the objection.

Claims 59, 70, and 73 were objected to for informalities, which objection has been obviated by the amendment of the claims as kindly suggested in the Official Action.

Claims 58 through 87 were rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1, 2, and 5 through 16 of parent U.S. Patent No. 6,611,285 B1. And Claims 58 through 87 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,313,875 B1 (Suga, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 58, 63, and 68 recite, *inter alia*, in a case where the designations include a predetermined plurality of commands for the same operation, *not* controlling the video camera in accordance with each of the predetermined plurality of commands, and in a case where the designations do not include a predetermined plurality of commands for the same operation, controlling the video camera in accordance with each of the predetermined plurality of commands.

Claims 73, 78, and 83 variously recite, *inter alia*, in a case where the designations include a predetermined plurality of commands for the same operation, *not* transmitting each of the image signals in accordance with each of the predetermined plurality of commands, and in a case where the designations do not include a predetermined plurality of commands for the same operation, transmitting each of the image signals in accordance with the predetermined plurality of commands.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that neither (a) ‘285 Claims 1, 2, and 5 through 16 nor (b) Suga, et al. discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 58, 63, 68, 73, 78, and 83. Applicant further respectfully submits that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at such features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant’s undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Attorney for Applicant
Daniel S. Glueck
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DSG/mcm

FCHS_WS 1554903v1